

cannot reach agreement on that. Talk about finding common ground. Even with the Ensign amendment that says a father cannot sue, he can still take the daughter across State lines. And the Federal Government can still sue the grandmother or the clergy.

This debate is just beginning. The Senator from Nevada and I are friends, but we will have a tough debate. I hope we will vote for the Democratic amendment to improve this bill.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived and passed, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:37 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 4689

(Purpose: To authorize grants to carry out programs to provide education on preventing teen pregnancies, and for other purposes)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4689, which is at the desk, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 4689.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Monday, July, 24, 2006, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering gets to the heart of the issue this bill purportedly means to address; that is, reducing the number of abortions. The best way to reduce the number of abortions is to prevent teen pregnancies in the first place. It is that simple.

The amendment I am offering, along with Senators MENENDEZ, CLINTON, SCHUMER, KENNEDY, KERRY, and FEINSTEIN, is aimed at dramatically reducing teen pregnancy rates in the United States. This amendment will assist efforts by nonprofit organizations, schools, and public health agencies to reduce teen pregnancy through awareness, education, and abstinence programs.

The root problem we are talking about today is not abortion, it is teen pregnancy. If we do nothing about teen pregnancy, yet pass this punitive bill, then it proves that this exercise is only a political charade and not a serious effort to combat the problem.

The U.S. teen pregnancy rate is the highest by far among developed countries, and here is some of the evidence we use to prove this.

In Germany, the teen pregnancy rate is 16 per 1,000. The U.S. rate is 84 per 1,000. I ask my colleagues to look at this chart which shows several countries teen pregnancy rates compared with the U.S. This is teen pregnancy rate for ages 15 to 19, among developed countries per 1,000 persons. In Sweden, it is 25 young women per 1,000; in France, it is 20 young women per 1,000; in Canada, 46; in Great Britain, 47; and here we are. Are we the winners in this contest? I hardly think so. We have 84 unintended teenage pregnancies per 1,000 persons.

I mentioned before that Germany has a teen pregnancy rate of 16 per 1,000, and again, I mention the rate in the United States is 84 per 1,000. So it tells us that there is something terribly wrong about the way we do things here.

I look further at Belgium, which has a teen pregnancy rate of 14 per 1,000; the Netherlands, 12 per 1,000; and ours is 84 per 1,000. We cannot continue to ignore facts such as these. We can pass all the abortion restrictions we can think of, but unless there are fewer teen pregnancies, the results will be tragic for thousands of young women.

In many cases, teen pregnancies result in abortion, but that is not the extent of the problem. We know that children of teenage mothers typically have lower birth weight deliveries, are more likely to perform poorly in school, and are at greater risk of abuse and neglect than other children. The sons of teen mothers are 13 percent more likely to end up in prison, while teen daughters are 22 percent more likely to become teen mothers themselves.

Each year in the United States, approximately 860,000 young women become pregnant before they reach the age of 20. Eighty percent of these pregnancies—80 percent of 860,000. That is over 600,000 young women are unintended, and 81 percent of these young women are unmarried.

So what are we doing differently in the United States that is separating us from the rest of the developed world? The answer is simple: the other countries promote full, comprehensive sex education programs, and in the United States—would you believe it—we don't allow funding for comprehensive sex education. I repeat that because some people may think they misheard me. The Federal Government will not fund comprehensive sex education programs despite the fact that 90 percent of parents polled say that in addition to abstinence, sex education should cover contraception and other forms of birth

control. But the Federal Government currently will not fund any programs that even mention contraception and restricts all of its funding to abstinence-only programs.

I want to be clear, I am not against abstinence programs. In fact, our amendment will also fund abstinence programs. I think they can be effective at times. But the Federal Government's current policy of restricting funding to abstinence-only programs is producing the wrong result. Just look at how poorly our teenage pregnancy rates compare with other nations.

We need to dedicate our scarce Federal resources toward medically accurate, age-appropriate education that includes information about contraception as well as abstinence. In many cases, particular types of contraception can help avoid sexually transmitted diseases. Isn't that a good objective as well? We have to be realistic about the hope that each and every teenager is going to abstain from premarital sex. Saying "Don't do it" may work at times but not all the time.

Look at another problem—youth smoking, for instance. Kids are bombarded with warnings not to smoke. These messages have cut teen smoking rates dramatically, but 1,500 kids a day still start smoking. So it needs intensity of education, comprehensive education.

We remember First Lady Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No to Drugs" campaign. It worked for some kids but obviously not for others. For those teenagers who already are sexually active or who do become sexually active, we fail them if we don't teach them about contraception. If we are serious about reducing the number of unintended pregnancies, almost half of which tragically end in abortion—we have to implement programs that work so that our teenagers have the knowledge they need to bring about a positive future for themselves with the opportunity to pursue their dreams. We create a huge number of abortions as a result of the ignorance of what the facts are, about sex and young people.

This year, the Federal Government will direct \$176 million of taxpayers' money to abstinence-only programs. Some of these programs can be effective but often don't get the job done because many teenagers need to understand something about contraception and other aspects of a comprehensive sex education program. Research has shown that the most effective programs are the ones that encourage teenagers to delay sexual activity but also provide information on how they can protect themselves. What is more, research shows that teenagers who receive sex education which includes discussion of contraception are more likely to delay sexual activity than those who receive abstinence-only messages.

There was an interesting article in this Saturday's Wall Street Journal about a sex education program in Bamberg County, SC. The article said: